EXHIBIT 1-12

Highly Confidential - Attorneys' Eyes Only

```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
 2
             NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 3
                  SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
 4
 5
     ORACLE AMERICA, INC., )
 6
 7
              Plaintiff, )
                        ) No. CV 10-03561 WHA
8
     VS.
     GOOGLE, INC.,
 9
10
              Defendant. )
11
12
13
14
        HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY
15
16
17
           VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF HASAN RIZVI
18
                 THURSDAY, JULY 28, 2011
19
20
21
     REPORTED BY:
22
     JANIS JENNINGS, CSR 3942, CLR, CCRR
23
24
25
     PAGES 1 - 275
                                                    Page 1
```

Highly Confidential - Attorneys' Eyes Only

1 further discussions? 1 A. Yes. A. I don't remember the exact words, but the 2 O. Who is that? 3 third discussion itself was, like I said, a 3 A. That is that privileged? 4 MR. NORTON: Do you mind if we take a 4 non discussion. There was nothing really to 5 discuss, so as we left the meeting, there wasn't 5 short break? 6 anything scheduled as a follow up. 6 MR. PURCELL: Sure. 7 BY MR. PURCELL: Q. Did Mr. Rubin say anything at that third 8 meeting to indicate to Oracle that Google was no Q. I mean, just so it's clear, I'm not asking 9 anything Oracle's lawyers might have told you. But 9 longer interested in discussing a potential business 10 solution? 10 if you learned of the fact of a meeting between 11 A. Again, I don't remember the exact words, 11 Google and Oracle about a certain subject, the fact 12 but the I don't remember the exact words, no. 12 of the meeting between Google and Oracle isn't Q. Did Mr. Rubin give any indication, verbal 13 privileged. 14 or otherwise, that Google was not interested in 14 MR. NORTON: I I think he's already 15 continuing the discussions after that third meeting? 15 answered that question, though. On to another A. From what I recall, he said this is 16 question about the substance of the communication, 17 again, not necessarily his words, but the 17 if there if there was one, so 18 implication was that this is a non starter, there is MR. PURCELL: Well, it would be the 19 really nothing to discuss given the range of the 19 substance of the communication between Google and 20 business that we are talking about. That's the 20 Oracle, which isn't privileged. That's all I want 21 that's the recollection I have. 21 to know. Q. Do you mean that he suggested that it was 22 MR. NORTON: Again, I just don't think 23 a non starter for Google to compensate Oracle in the 23 that was the question. 24 range of \$300 to \$500 million? MR. PURCELL: Okay. Well, let me ask 25 A. That's 25 let me ask the question, then. Page 170 MR. NORTON: Objection to form. 1

1 BY MR. PURCELL:

- Q. Are you aware I think you already said
- 3 you are aware of communications between Oracle and
- 4 Google after the third meeting you had with
- 5 Mr. Rubin about a potential business solution;
- 6 correct?
- 7 A. Yes.
- Q. What what was discussed at that meeting
- 9 between Oracle and Google?
- 10 A. I don't know.
- MR. NORTON: Objection. To the extent
- 12 that your knowledge of the contents of that
- 13 meeting to the extent you know that only from
- 14 communications with attorneys, then I'm going to
- 15 assert the privilege and ask you not to answer that
- 16 question.
- MR. PURCELL: Counsel, I don't want to
- 18 argue with you in detail, but I just think that
- 19 instruction is overbroad. If he learns of a
- 20 nonprivileged fact through a lawyer, that doesn't
- 21 make the fact privileged. And all I'm trying to ask
- 22 for is the nonprivileged fact regarding the
- 23 communications between Google and Oracle.
- MR. NORTON: Let's take a break and I can 24

25 see if I can

Page 171

25 being filed?

2

3

9

12

13

16

17

21

22

You can answer.

A. Not that I remember, no.

4 way I remember it, yeah.

5 BY MR. PURCELL:

11 filing of this lawsuit?

20 BY MR. PURCELL:

THE WITNESS: Yeah. That's kind of the

Q. Did Mr. Rubin suggest a different range in

7 which Google might be willing to compensate Oracle?

Q. Did Oracle attempt to make any follow up

Q. Are you aware of anyone else from Oracle

THE WITNESS: With Mr. Rubin, no. I'm

10 with Mr. Rubin after the third meeting prior to the

A. I don't know about Oracle, but I didn't.

14 following up with Mr. Rubin about a potential

15 business solution prior to this lawsuit being filed?

18 not I don't know who it would I don't know if

Q. Are you aware from of strike that.

Are you aware of anybody at Oracle

23 following up with anybody at Google regarding a

24 potential business solution prior to this lawsuit

19 anybody followed up with Mr. Rubin.

MR. NORTON: Objection to form.

44 (Pages 170 - 173)

Page 173

Page 172